

IMESS DISSERTATION



Note: Please email the completed mark sheet to Year 2 coordinator

(cc Julia Korosteleva j.korosteleva@ucl.ac.uk and Marta Kotwas m.kotwas@ucl.ac.uk)

Please note that IMESS students are not required to use a particular set of methods (e.g. qualitative, quantitative, or comparative) in their dissertation.

Student:	Lisa Nguyen
Dissertation title:	Innovation Benefits from European Union Ascendancy: An Econometric Analysis

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Poor
Knowledge <i>Knowledge of problems involved, e.g. historical and social context, specialist literature on the topic. Evidence of capacity to gather information through a wide and appropriate range of reading, and to digest and process knowledge.</i>	x		
Analysis & Interpretation <i>Demonstrates a clear grasp of concepts. Application of appropriate methodology and understanding; willingness to apply an independent approach or interpretation recognition of alternative interpretations; Use of precise terminology and avoidance of ambiguity; avoidance of excessive generalisations or gross oversimplifications.</i>		x	
Structure & Argument <i>Demonstrates ability to structure work with clarity, relevance and coherence. Ability to argue a case; clear evidence of analysis and logical thought; recognition of an arguments limitation or alternative views; Ability to use other evidence to support arguments and structure appropriately.</i>		x	
Presentation & Documentation <i>Accurate and consistently presented footnotes and bibliographic references; accuracy of grammar and spelling; correct and clear presentation of charts/graphs/tables or other data. Appropriate and correct referencing throughout. Correct and contextually correct handling of quotations.</i>		x	

ECTS Mark:	B	UCL Mark:	68	Marker:	Dr Filipa Figueira
<i>Deducted for late submission:</i>		0	Signed:	Filipa Figueira	
<i>Deducted for inadequate referencing:</i>		0	Date:	12.6.2016	

MARKING GUIDELINES

A (UCL mark 70+; Charles University mark = 1): Note: marks of over 80 are given rarely and only for truly exceptional pieces of work.

Distinctively sophisticated and focused analysis, critical use of sources and insightful interpretation. Comprehensive understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research.

B/C (UCL mark 60-69; Charles University mark =2):

A high level of analysis, critical use of sources and insightful interpretation. Good understanding of techniques applicable to the chosen field of research, showing an ability to engage in sustained independent research. 65 or over equates to a B grade.

D/E (UCL mark 50-59; Charles University mark = 3):

Demonstration of a critical use of sources and ability to engage in systematic inquiry. An ability to engage in sustained research work, demonstrating methodological awareness. 55 or over equates to a D grade.

F (UCL mark less than 50; Charles University mark = neprospělúa):

Demonstrates failure to use sources and an inadequate ability to engage in systematic inquiry. Inadequate evidence of ability to engage in sustained research work and poor understanding of appropriate research techniques.

CONTINUES OVERLEAF
PLEASE PROVIDE SUBSTANTIVE AND
DETAILED FEEDBACK!

Constructive comments, explaining strengths and weaknesses (at least 300 words):

Best features

The dissertation addresses a clear research question – what was the impact of EU entry on innovation, as measured by number of patents and expenditure on R&D.

It provides clear value added, as the methodology used differs from previous studies, and offers improvements in relation to previous work.

Student shows an excellent understanding of the different fields of literature connected with the dissertation, including, most importantly, the literature on innovation.

The dissertation is well structured and follows a logical argument.

Suggestions for Improvement

There is some conflation of two separate questions: what is the impact of financial integration in the EU on innovation, and what is the impact of EU integration as a whole on innovation. In particular, the discussion and interpretation of the results is mainly focused on financial integration, and does not take into account other factors linked with EU membership.

More generally, it could have been better to make the model more specific, by focusing only on one factor such as only financial integration or only on the middle-income trap. This is because it is likely that different factors associated with EU membership will have different impacts on innovation. For example, financial integration and access to more capital may lead to more availability of private funding for research, but this may lead to less public funding for research being made available. Another example, the Single Market may lead to the specialisation of new Member States in low-tech products, which may have a negative impact on innovation (middle-income trap). Another example, the improvement in the institutional environment should have a positive impact on entrepreneurship and human capital, leading to more innovation.

Therefore, by combining all these different impacts into one model, it is difficult to obtain a result on what the impact of EU accession really was on innovation. There is therefore a danger that the results are reflecting overall economic trends which happened to coincide with EU accession – for example the impact of the financial crisis on 2008 and ensuing economic downturn.

Clarity and writing style could sometimes be improved.

On the whole, a very good dissertation!

Specific questions you would like addressing at the oral defence (at least 2 questions):

How would you describe the value added that your dissertation brings to the existing literature?

How would you respond to the point above that different factors associated with EU membership may have completely different impacts on innovations, and could therefore be best measured separately?

What policy implications would you derive from your research?